Second Member of Council.—

Repair of roads is a different matter.

Mr. T. Mariappa.—

Then, what was the object of levying tolls ?

Second Member of Council.—

They wanted money for carrying out road maintenance works.

Mr. T. Mariappa.—

What is the probable annual income from the toll-gate ?

Second Member of Council.—

Notice.

Mr. T. Mariappa.—

With reference to the answer furnished to sub-sections (*j*), (*k*) and (*l*), will the Government obtain the information and furnish the same to the House ?

Second Member of Council.—

The information may be obtained from the District Board direct.

Mr. Mir Mahomed Sab.—

To what head are the realisations from the toll-gate credited ?

Second Member of Council.—

To the District Board Budget.

Mr. Mir Mahomed Sab.—

Would this money be spent for any special purposes ?

Second Member of Council.—

The District Board must decide that point. This is a district fund toll-gate and whatever decision they arrive at will be perfectly in order.

REPRESENTATIONS—(*Concluded*).

No. 9.—Levy of dry assessment in lieu of wet assessment.
Mr. Chennaraya Reddy, Chikballapur Taluk.

It is prayed that wherever dry crops are raised on wet lands in the *atchkat* of a tank due to paucity of water therein, dry assessment in lieu of wet assessment be levied. As the capacity of the tanks has been decreasing due to gradual silting up during the past 20 years, a programme of tank works may be prepared having regard to the financial resources and urgency of the work.

The subject was not discussed owing to the absence of the mover.

No. 10.—Reduction of *hissa* fees under the Record of Rights Regulation.

Mr. A. V. Suryanarayana Setty, Arkalgud Taluk.

MR. SURYANARAYANA SETTY represented that in taluks brought under the Record of Rights Scheme, a fee of Rs. 2 was being levied for each sub-division and eight annas for each entire survey number not requiring sub-division. By a recent Government order, that fee had been reduced in respect of taluks to be brought under the scheme hereafter. He prayed that the order might be made applicable to all the taluks where the scheme had been already introduced and the raiyats enabled to get some rebate on the amounts they had paid at higher rate.

THE DEWAN observed that this was not possible.

No. 11.—Cancellation of the levy of mutation fees in connection with the Record of Rights.

Mr. S. Visvesvara Rao, Sorab Taluk.

MR. S. VISVESVARA RAO said that the Record of Rights was in fact not only a record of rights but also a record of liabilities. When a person died, if the right of ownership had to be transferred to his son, the record of rights fees had to be paid for such a transfer. It was thus in the nature of an inheritance fee and was therefore opposed to law and equity. For these reasons, he prayed that the fees in such cases might be cancelled.

He also added that originally the khatedar was responsible for the payment of assessment, but now the registered occupant was made responsible for it, with a view to strengthen the hands of the Government.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that the khatedar was never solely responsible for the payment of assessment. The primary responsibility lay with the khatedar or registered occupant and both the khatedar and other occupants were jointly responsible for it. There had been no change in the law and the department knew well from whom to demand. Whatever was done was done, not with a view to strengthen the hands of the Government, but to safeguard the interests of the tenants.

MR. S. VISVESVARA RAO pointed out that if a person holding 40 numbers died and if these had to be transferred to the name of his son, a sum of Rs. 40 had to be paid under the existing rules. As Government would be put to no sort of expenditure on that account, no fees should be levied for such transfers.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER observed that sufficient staff had to be maintained and, to meet the cost incurred on it, fees had to be levied.

MR. S. VISVESVARA RAO said that where phoding was necessary, the prescribed fees might be levied, but in cases where the right had to be merely transferred from one person to another, there was no justification for levying record of rights fees.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER observed that in cases where a large number of *hissas* were concerned, the Deputy Commissioner had discretion to reduce the amount.

MR. T. S. VENKAPPA also represented that it was inequitable to levy the fee when Government incurred no expenditure for effecting the transfer. If there were 30 or 40 numbers to be transferred, the fee would be Rs. 30 or 40; whereas the assessment on all the numbers put together might not be even Rs. 10 or 20. In the Bombay Presidency no such fee was being levied.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that the Government would examine the point whether in cases of mere transfer of right, it would be possible to fix a maximum limit. He also added that the rules in force in the Bombay Presidency would be looked into. It might be possible to insist on full payment only in cases of alienations.

MR. T. S. VENKAPPA represented that owing to the present economic condition no fees should be levied in other cases also.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that it was not possible to accept the suggestion.

MR. ANEKAL SRINIVASA IYENGAR said that if in any particular number, phoding was necessary before transfer, then the Government would be justified in levying the fee and not when the entire number was transferred, for, with the exception of the transfer of the right from one party to another, there would be no additional work devolving upon the department.

A MEMBER from Koppa said that in certain places, measuring work was over and the Deputy Commissioner had given two years' time for the people to file objections, if any.

The period stipulated had expired, but even now the raiyats had not received maps. In certain cases, the ownership of the lands had changed hands and the raiyats themselves did not know how those changes had come about. The notifications were all confined to the Gazette and the raiyats were not aware how so many alienations had come about. He therefore requested that the time for sending up *takrars* might be extended.

MR. RAMANNA represented that in a survey number for the first *phod* full fee might be levied and for the subsequent *phods*, only one half of it. At present Rs. 1-12-0 was being levied for every *phod*, and if any one wanted any concession he had to write to the Deputy Commissioner on 12 annas stamp paper. The result was that even if concession was shown by the Deputy Commissioner, it would not be of any advantage to the party.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that Government would consider whether they could fix any maximum fee in cases where the number of *phods* in one and the same holding was large.

No. 12.—Reduction of coffee upset price
Mr. Ramappa Gowda, Chikmagalur Taluk.

MR. B. P. BASAPPA SETTY represented that for coffee cultivation a very large investment of capital was required. The upset price of Rs. 20 per acre had acted as a set back to coffee cultivation, for the people would have no money left with them for cultivation purposes after purchasing the land. Also, as the price of coffee had gone down, there was no justification to fix the upset price at Rs. 20 per acre. For the last four or five years, the number of applications for coffee lands had considerably gone down on account of the inability of the people to pay such a high rate. The object of the Government should be to improve the condition of the people in the malnad. The Government should therefore reduce the upset price to its original level of Rs. 10 per acre. After all, the enhanced rate had not brought in any large income to Government.

MR. BAGAMANE DEVA GOWDA said that when the upset price was Rs. 10 per acre, very good lands were available. But now all those lands had been occupied and what was left over was only third rate or gravelly soil which was not at all suited for the purpose of coffee cultivation. With a view to realising larger incomes, Government had enhanced the upset price from Rs. 10 to 40 per acre but the result of it was that applications for lands had become rare. Then the

rate was reduced to Rs. 20 but fresh applications were not forthcoming. That was due to the price of coffee having gone down and the cultivation expenses having gone high. The demand for tea having fallen, many tea estates were being resigned. At such a time if Government encouraged coffee cultivation by reducing the upset price, they might realise a large income from fresh darkhast applications. He also requested that owners of coffee lands must be permitted to extend coffee cultivation over larger areas.

MR. MIR MAHOMED SAB said that unless the upset price was reduced, Government would continue to lose heavily.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that Government would see how best to avoid such losses.

MR. BELLUR DYAVAPPA GOWDA said that after the enhancement of the upset price, applications for coffee lands were not coming up. The lands available for cultivation were of a poor type and the prices for them should be reduced to Rs. 10.

DHARMAPRAVARTHA M. L. NAGAPPA SETTY said that the upset price of coffee lands was enhanced owing to the rise in price of coffee. The high prices continued only for a short period. When they fell, representations were made to the Government and the upset price was reduced to Rs. 20. Even that price was high and this was the reason why people were not coming forward to purchase the lands which had become available due to resignations. Government should consider whether by enhancing the rate, they had realised anything more than they would have if the price was at the old level, or whether they had been incurring any loss. He was sure that Government would not lose anything by reducing the upset price to Rs. 10. On the other hand, they were sure to derive more income in two ways, firstly, by sale of lands and secondly, by way of increased assessments.

THE DEWAN observed that the question would be examined.

No 13.—Permission to khatedars for removal of timber from *hiduvali kans.*

Messrs. G. Basappa Gowda, Nagar Taluk; Channappa Setty and Kollappa Gowda, Sagar Taluk.

MR. G. BASAPPA GOWDA prayed that permission be granted to the khatedars for the removal of timber from the *hiduvali kans* for their own use.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that except gum, honey, *soppu* and such other minor products, nothing

could be removed from *kans* as they were the property of Government. He added that the people's rights and privileges in *kans* had been discussed by the Assembly on former occasions, that the privileges that could be enjoyed by the kan-holders had been settled long ago and that it was not possible to increase the existing privileges. At the same time there was no intention of withdrawing any special privileges which kan-holders in particular cases were enjoying as per *mamool*.

MR. G. BASAPPA GOWDA prayed that at least such of the concessions as had been recognised under the Malnad Raiyats' Special Privileges Rules might be extended to the kan-holders and declared exercisable within their *kans*.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL pointed out that under those rules they could remove timber from district forests.

MR. TUDKI RAMANNA GOWDA represented that there was no more timber available in district forests. He therefore requested permission for kan-holders to grow timber around their *kans*. He also requested that they should be permitted to remove timber from *hiduvali kans* where it was available.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL enquired of the Chief Conservator of Forests whether it was true that District Forests contained no timber.

THE CHIEF CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS replied that there was plenty of timber.

MR. TUDKI RAMANNA GOWDA observed that it was not so. He pointed out that the *hiduvali kans* were situated round about the cultivated lands and said that the kan-holders looked after the trees in the *kans* and saw that they did not die. But they had no power to cut them.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that it was not possible to permit the kan-holders to remove timber from *hiduvali kans*.

MR. G. BASAPPA GOWDA requested that enquiries might be made whether there was any good timber at all anywhere else in the District Forests which were in the neighbourhood of *kans* and that the concessions prayed for be given if it was found reasonable to do so.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that if there were any cases of special difficulty in getting timber they might be brought to the notice of the Deputy Commissioner in writing and the question how far such difficulty could be obviated would be considered.

No. 14.—Extending the restrictions laid down for the repairs of Government tanks to those of Inam villages.

Messrs. B. M. Munisamappa, Bangalore Taluk; B. L. Byanna Bangalore City Municipality and S. N. Sitarama Rao, Special Interests.

MR. B. L. BYANNA observed that the tanks in Inam villages were in a state of disrepair. Due to the non-removal of silt, the storage capacity of the tanks had decreased with the result that no good crops could be raised on the lands below the tanks. As the Inamdars also were paying kandayam on their lands, he prayed that the restrictions laid down for the repairs of Government tanks might be extended to those of Inam villages.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that the question was one for the Inam Committee to consider.

RAO SAHIB M. RAMASWAMY observed that due to indifference on the part of the Inamdars to repair the tanks in their villages and the non-challant attitude on the part of the raiyats in the matter of payment of contribution for the purpose, the tanks were all going to ruin and he requested that the rules in force in regard to the restoration of Government tanks should be made applicable to tanks in Inam villages also.

A MEMBER from Krishnarajpet observed that the raiyats of Inam villages were ready to pay contribution.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that when the report of the Inam Committee was received, Government would consider whether any modifications in this behalf were called for in the Regulation.

MR. S. C. MALLIAH pointed out that in many cases the repairs could not be undertaken due to the Inamdars not paying the contribution although the tenants were ready to pay their share of the contribution. The Inamdars never gave heed to the requests of the tenants for repairs.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL enquired whether the member suggested that the Inamdars should be compelled to pay their contribution.

MR. V. V. IYER did not know how the Inamdars could get money to repair the tanks when even the Government were faced with financial stringency.

THE DEWAN observed that on that account the tanks should not be allowed to remain in a state of disrepair.

MR. V. V. IYER asked whether Government would help the Inamdars with loans.

THE DEWAN replied that that was a different matter.

DHARMAPRAVARTHA M. L. NAGAPPA SETTY observed that if there were any conditions in regard to repairs attaching to the grant of Inams they might be enforced now, and not otherwise.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER replied that very equitable orders had been passed by Government.

MR. H. R. KRISHNAMURTHYA CHAR pointed out that the Inamdars had no power to compel the raiyats to do earthwork.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that the whole matter was engaging the attention of the Inam Committee appointed by Government and that their report was awaited before taking any further action.

MR. H. R. KRISHNAMURTHYA CHAR enquired whether the committee would tour round and take evidence.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER replied that it was not possible to tour round all the 77 taluks; they had toured 10–12 taluks in three districts and that was perhaps sufficient.

ANOTHER MEMBER saw no reason why the raiyats alone should be compelled to do earthwork when the Inamdars also held nearly half the extent of lands below the tanks in Inam villages.

THE DEWAN observed that the matter was under the consideration of the Inam Committee and that their report was awaited.

No. 15.—Concession to Adikarnatakas.
Mr. M. C. Chaluviah, Minority Interests.

MR. M. C. CHALUVIAH prayed that concession might be granted to Adikarnatakas to pay only half the contribution on all lands owned by them under the Irwin Canal. He added that it was difficult for them to pay even dry rates and it would be much more difficult to pay the contribution required. He therefore requested that the representation be considered favourably.

THE DEWAN replied that a large sum of money had been invested on the reservoir and canals and that there should be an adequate return on it and that the request could not therefore be complied with.

No. 16.—Exchange of lands under Krishnarajasagara and grant of cash compensation.

Messrs. M. C. Linge Gowda and S. C. Malliah, Mandya Taluk; K. V. Veeranna, Chamrajanagar Taluk; C. Mari Gowda, Krishnarajpet Taluk; K. M. Krishnappa Gowda, Nagamangala Taluk; Kulle Gowda, S. Devayya and Sivananje Gowda, Seringapatam Taluk; M. Subbaiya, Seringapatam Municipality; G. Mallanna and R. Devayya, Mysore Taluk; Gurukar Nanjappa, Gundlupet Taluk; B. Channappa, Yedatore Taluk; H. R. T. Rajagopala Mudaliar and Hanumantha Setty, Hunsur Taluk; Puttaswami Gowda, Malvalli Taluk; H. C. Dasappa and K. Dhanakoti Setty, Special Interests; T. Mariappa and Ibrahim Khan Sahib, Minority Interests.

MR. S. C. MALLIAH represented that *puja* service was not being conducted in temples whose Inam lands were submerged under the Krishnarajasagara Dam as the Government waste lands granted by Government in exchange were not yielding anything and prayed—

(1) that the performance of *puja* in those temples be restored by awarding exchange lands at the rate of three to one, taking back the waste lands which had been given in exchange,

(2) that whenever expropriated raiyats selected lands at any place, Government unassessed *kharab* and other lands might be granted to them at the rate of three acres to one acre without resorting to the present procedure of obtaining *mahazars* from the raiyats of the concerned villages, and

(3) that the cash compensation at Rs. 40 per acre being too low it might be fixed at Rs. 60 to Rs. 100 per acre as before by classifying the lands.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that no general orders could be passed on the matter and that if specific instances where lands given in exchange could not be cultivated were brought to notice, necessary enquiries would be made and suitable action taken to remedy the difficulties.

ONE MEMBER pointed out that although lands were available for being given in exchange, the revenue officers insisted upon obtaining *mahazars* from the concerned villagers.

MR. G. MALLANNA observed that cash compensation was not being paid with reference to the quality of the land acquired and complained that many instances of invidious distinctions had come to his notice.

THE DEWAN replied that compensation was fixed with reference to the quality of land and in accordance with the land acquisition rules.

No. 17.—Concession to raiyats.

Messrs. M. C. Linge Gowda and S. C. Malliah, Mandya Taluk; K. V. Veeranna, Chamarajanagar Taluk; C. Mari Gowda, Krishnarajpet Taluk; K. M. Krishnappa Gowda, Nagamangala Taluk; Kulle Gowda, S. Devayya and Sivananje Gowda, Seringapatam Taluk; M. Subbaiya, Seringapatam Municipality; G. Mallanna and R. Devayya, Mysore Taluk; Gurukar Nanjappa, Gundlupet Taluk; B. Channappa, Yedatore Taluk; H. R. T. Rajagopala Mudaliar and Hanumantha Setty, Hunsur Taluk; Puttaswami Gowda, Malvalli Taluk; H. C. Dasappa and K. Dhanakoti Setty, Special Interests; T. Mariappa and Ibrahim Khan Sahib, Minority Interests.

MR. S. C. MALLIAH observed that malnad allowances were being paid to officials residing in malnad as there was

malaria in the malnad parts. But, as the disease was not confined to malnad alone and had spread to Mysore and other parts, there was no reason why the allowance should continue to be paid to officials in the malnad only. Secondly, Government officials had not got the difficulties which the raiyats had to contend against. He prayed that in view of the present financial stringency the malnad allowances and house rents, etc., now granted to officials of certain departments be stopped and the raiyats who were put to much hardship shown some concession by way of either remission of *kandayam* or suspension of *isthihar* fee, *haraz* fee and also notice fees. He added that if possible extra relief also might be given.

MR. MIR MAHOMED SAB did not agree to the stopping of the grant of malnad allowances. He observed that few men were willing to go to the malnad even though the malnad allowances were given; and if even those allowances were withdrawn nobody would be prepared to take up service in the malnad.

THE DEWAN replied that no allowances were being given to officials whose emoluments exceeded Rs. 50 per mensem and that in the case of officials getting less than Rs. 50 per mensem a special locality allowance of one anna per rupee, subject to a minimum of Rs. 1-8-0 per mensem, was being given. He added that the savings which would result from the abolition of this allowance would be less than half a lakh of rupees.

MANY MEMBERS were against the abolition of the allowance, and the DEWAN said that the representation could not be accepted.

No. 18.—Takrar Taktes.

Messrs. M. C. Linge Gowda and S. C. Malliah, Mandya Taluk; K. V. Veeranna, Chamarajanagar Taluk; C. Mari Gowda, Krishnarajpet Taluk; K. M. Krishnappa Gowda, Nagamangala Taluk; Kulle Gowda, S. Devaiya and Sivananje Gowda, Seringapatam Taluk; M. Subbaiya, Seringapatam Municipality; G. Mallanna and R. Devayya, Mysore Taluk; Gurukar Nanjappa, Gundlupet Taluk; B. Channappa, Yedatore Taluk; H. R. T. Rajagopala Mudaliar and Hanumantha Setty, Hunsur Taluk; Puttaswami Gowda, Malvalli Taluk; H. C. Dasappa and K. Dhanakoti Setty, Special Interests; T. Mariappa and Ibrahim Khan Sahib, Minority Interests.

MR. PUTTASWAMI GOWDA represented that the levy of fine on *takrar taktes* presented by village officials for encroachment on Government lands without ascertaining whether there had been any real encroachment or not, worked as a great hardship on the raiyats. He therefore prayed that *takrar taktes* might be ordered to be disposed

of in proper manner after taking necessary measurements of extents involved and preparation of sketches.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that the statements contained in the representation were not correct. The usual procedure in cases of the kind referred to was for the Amildar to ask the Sheikdar to go, inspect and submit a report after which the Amildar issued notices to the parties and took statements from the persons concerned. It was only then a decision arrived at as to whether there was any encroachment or not. If the party concerned disputed the decision, then the Amildar himself inspected the spot and after satisfying himself that there was encroachment levied a fine; if there was no encroachment, there was of course no punishment or hardship.

MR. PUTTASWAMI GOWDA observed that even though there were no encroachments the Amildars imposed fines; and the parties concerned preferred paying the fines to contesting the validity of the order as they knew very well the difficulties and troubles attendant on going in appeal.

THE DEWAN replied that if specific instances were brought to notice they would be enquired into.

MR. PUTTASWAMI GOWDA observed that the Sheikdars who never inspected the lands, generally prepared the *takrar taktes* sitting on the pials of their own houses. On the basis of such *mahazars* the Amildars levied the fines. And the raiyats were compelled to pay them up. Nobody measured the actual extent of encroachments, if any, and even if the extent was only five guntas it was put down as one acre. He therefore requested that, at least as an experimental measure, the Mojinidars might be asked to measure the actual extents of encroachments in one district and also prepare necessary sketches.

MR. S. C. MALLIAH said that in certain circumstances there might be encroachments and subsequent sale by the owner of the land; and in such circumstances the revenue officers should go and see whether the boundaries of the land sold were all right or whether there had been any encroachment prior to the sale. But they were not doing this though the purchaser asked them to do. Even in such a case, if a *takrar takte* was presented later on, the Amildar fined the purchaser. The speaker did not know why the purchaser should be fined when there was no wilful encroachment on his part.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER replied that if there were any such bad cases they might be brought to the notice of

Sub-Division Officers in appeal. He added that a circular had been issued to the effect that *takrar taktes* should be disposed of only after hearing the parties concerned.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that only a general statement was being made by the members that the rules in regard to the disposal of *takrar taktes* were not being applied strictly by the Amildar. But, according to recent instructions, no case would be disposed of without taking into consideration the *bona fides* of the party.

MR. B. L. BYANNA observed that if a party concerned represented that out of spite a *takrar takte* was filed against him by the village officials and that really there was no real encroachment, it was but right that the Mojinidar or, better still, the Amildar should inspect and satisfy himself whether the representation was true. Instead of doing this, the Amildar believed the reports furnished to him and decided the case accordingly. There were many cases like this and not one per cent of such cases were really gone into.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER replied that if facts and figures were given he would enquire into them.

MR. H. K. MADAIYA said that generally encroachments would be of only either *kharab* or *banjar* or *gomal* lands and not of survey numbers. With a view to ward off wild pigs and other animals which might damage the crops, the raiyat had sometimes to put up a fence around his land and technically this might sometimes mean encroachment. *Takrar taktes* were presented in such cases and the Amildar fined the raiyat, at times far more than the value of the land encroached upon. The speaker therefore thought that in such cases it would be better if at first a warning was given by the Amildar, the levy of a fine being resorted to only if the warning was not heeded to.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER doubted that the hardships complained of were so general. He said that he himself had seen cases of encroachments in which the Amildar had simply asked the raiyats to remove the fence.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL thought that the cases complained of by the member might be few, perhaps one or two in a thousand.

MR. V. V. IYER requested that a circular be issued to the effect that only after inspection by the Jamabandi officers should such cases be disposed of.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that it would not be possible to do that in every case.

MR. VEERASANJEEVA GOWDA observed that in the Allasandra Village, Closepet Taluk, there were about 20 cases of

alleged encroachment. The parties concerned, on notices being issued requiring them to appear before the Amildar, went to the taluk office. Some said that they did not at all encroach and some others said that they did not know whether they had encroached. And without enquiring into facts, the Amildar fined them Rs. 20 to Rs. 25 each. The speaker observed that there were many cases like that.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER replied that in such cases the parties might go in appeal and get the fine reduced or cancelled.

MANY MEMBERS said that if the parties had no alternative to going in appeal, there was no necessity for their grievances being represented in the Assembly.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that the specific cases referred to would be enquired and instructions issued not to levy heavy fines.

No. 19.—Tour programme.

Messrs. M. C. Linge Gowda and S. C. Malliah, Mandya Taluk; K. V. Veeranna, Chamarajanagar Taluk; C. Mari Gowda, Krishnarajpet Taluk; K. M. Krishnappa Gowda, Nagamangala Taluk; Kulle Gowda, S. Devayya and Sivananje Gowda, Seringapatam Taluk; M. Subbaiya, Seringapatam Municipality; G. Mallanna and R. Devayya, Mysore Taluk; Gurukar Nanjappa, Gundlupet Taluk; B. Channappa, Yedatore Taluk; H. R. T. Rajagopala Mudaliar and Hanumantha Setty, Hunsur Taluk; Puttaswami Gowda, Malvalli Taluk; H. C. Dasappa and K. Dhanakoti Setty, Special Interests; T. Mariappa and Ibrahim Khan Sahib, Minority Interests.

MR. S. C. MALLIAH observed that much inconvenience was being experienced for want of information regarding the absence of officers from headquarters on tour and that the raiyats who went there all the way from their villages had to come back owing to the officers' absence on tour. He therefore prayed that orders might be issued to cause copies of monthly tentative tour programmes of officers to be affixed to the notice board for the information of the public as before.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that it was not always possible for executive officers to adhere to programmes laid down very much in advance.

MR. S. C. MALLIAH said that as far as possible it might be done.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that if that fact was borne in mind by the general public, Government would have no objection to instruct local officers to notify their tentative tour programmes.

No. 20.—Abolition of hereditary *hakdari* of shanbhogi offices.

Messrs. M. C. Linge Gowda and S. C. Malliah, Mandya Taluk; K. V. Veeranna, Chamrajanagar Taluk; C. Mari Gowda, Krishnarajpet Taluk; K. M. Krishnappa Gowda, Nagamangala Taluk; Kulle Gowda, S. Devayya and Sivananje Gowda, Seringapatam Taluk; M. Subbaiya, Seringapatam Municipality; G. Mallanna and R. Devayya, Myosre Taluk; Gurukar Nanjappa, Gundlupet Taluk; B. Channappa, Yedatore Taluk; H. R. T. Rajagopala Mudaliar and Hanumantha Setty, Hunsur Taluk; Puttaswami Gowda, Malvalli Taluk; H. C. Dasappa and K. Dhanakoti Setty, Special Interests; T. Mariappa and Ibrahim Khan Sahib, Minority Interests.

MR. S. C. MALLIAH observed that the subject matter of the representation was not a new one. It had been often discussed in the Assembly and the Legislative Council. Government appointed a committee to go into the matter. But its recommendations were one-sided as had been expected, and the committee did not command the respect due to it owing to its defective representation; for, the very Government officials who spoke against the subject in the Assembly and the Council were made members of the committee and there were no non-officials on it. But that apart, he prayed that as an experimental measure, the salaried system might be tried in selected *firkas* and that if it proved successful it might be extended to the other parts of the State. He thought that by such an experiment the inconveniences of the people due to the present hereditary system would be very well known. He requested the Government not to advance their stock argument of financial stringency on this occasion also. After all, the scheme would not cost very much. Further, ways and means could be found out to minimise the cost of the scheme. For instance, more than one *firka* might be entrusted to each paid shanbhogue. Thereby the Government would be saving much by way of *potgi*. If this was done, there would not be so many representations coming up before the Assembly as now; because the position of every village depended upon the attitude of its officers and if they were honest and sympathetic, most of the grievances would disappear. Again, the *pahni* accounts, from which alone could the economic position of the raiyats be known, would be better maintained. Then again, the salaried system was in vogue in Coorg and other places and he thought that Mysore also could copy their example and see how far they would be well-advised in adopting it. He therefore prayed that the representation be sympathetically considered by the Government.

MR. T. MARIAPPA, in supporting the representation, observed that it was not the object of the members to

move people belonging to a particular community from their offices. There was no communal consideration behind the question. On the other hand, it was the principle of *hak*, that was being sought to be abolished. When Sheikdars who were doing revenue collection work were all salaried officials, he did not know why shanbhogues should be given a hereditary *hak*, for doing the same kind of work. All that was required was an agency to collect revenue and the Sheikdars themselves would do that work without the help of the shanbhogues. Now, because there was the *hak*, the shanbhogues did not do their duty properly as they were sure that they would receive their *potgi* whether they worked or not. And Government also had no control over them. There were many instances of original records being burnt by them with ulterior motives. Also there were many cases where the shanbhogues had taken perquisites from the raiyats. They had even collected more than the actual demand against the raiyats. They wielded an enormous influence in the villages as they had vested rights therein. Thus, many inconveniences were caused to the people by the shanbhogues. These had been discussed in both the Houses on past occasions. Hence, he thought that the salaried system was preferable to the present *hakdari*. Regarding the cost of the scheme, he said that the representatives of the people were ready to vote for any amount of expenditure. The question of cost should not come in the way of abolition of the present system. If necessary, the Government need not appoint highly paid shanbhogues. They might even transfer them from one place to another if it was thought that remaining in one and the same place would result in the creation of vested interests to the detriment of the people of the locality. The duties of two or three offices might be entrusted to one and the same official. For instance, the duties of the Village Panchayet Chairman might be entrusted to the shanbhogue. In all these ways the speaker thought that the cost might be minimised to a large extent. He therefore prayed that the representation be accepted by the Government.

CAPT. Y. V. AYYA who spoke next observed that the shanbhogues created a lot of mischief in villages. If their demands were not satisfied, they began to tease the illiterate raiyats by filing *takrar taktes* against them and in various other ways. They were up to creating factions and litigations. Due to their manipulations, many lands had changed hands without the owners themselves knowing. And such instances of mischief were being brought to the notice of the

Government in the two Houses. In order to obviate these and also to avoid loss to the Government in several ways, he thought it would be better if the salaried system were introduced and qualified persons, irrespective of communal considerations, appointed as shanbhogues. For these reasons he supported the representation.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA in supporting the representation observed that if a referendum in the whole State was taken on the subject, it would be seen that the majority of the raiyats would agree to the introduction of the salaried system. When all people liked the change, he did not know why the question of cost should come in its way. The people were ready to give assent to the necessary expenditure and if necessary would also agree to bear the burden of further taxation. He pointed out that many of the shanbhogues, whom he had occasion to consult, had themselves represented to him that the *potgi* given to them being low, they would be very willing to accept salaries instead. But he regretted that Government were not caring for the opinions of the public.

He added that the present system required to be changed from another standpoint also. The State stood to lose heavily so long as the system was not changed. There were many cases of misappropriations, some not coming to notice at all. A very strict vigilance was needed on the part of the higher officers. In this connection, he was reminded of one fact, for instance, that the rules required that a shanbhogue should not handle cash because he was only a clerk. Only the patel was empowered to collect revenue. But the speaker asked which revenue officer had enforced this rule. There were any number of such lapses, and he thought that the system itself was responsible for the non-observance of all these rules. Some might ask why the *hakdari* should be abolished in the case of the shanbhogi office only and why it should not be done in the case of the pateli office also. He had certainly no objection to the removal of hereditary *hakdari* attaching to pateli offices also if practical suggestions were forthcoming in that direction. But he thought that there were practical difficulties in such a step being taken. Nor was there any urgent need for it. While a patel's jurisdiction was generally confined to only one village, a shanbhogue's jurisdiction extended over a whole *firka*. His work therefore required to be watched carefully. And there was no general grievance against patels. Therefore, while the hereditary pateli office need not be abolished, there was urgent necessity for abolishing hereditary *hakdari* of shanbogi offices.

Continuing, he said that the salaried system was in vogue in Travancore and other places and might safely be introduced here also. There were other advantages also in having the salaried system. There were many graduates ready for accepting the posts of paid shanbhogues and they might be appointed in cases where the present incumbents did not wish to continue under the new system. Further, a larger jurisdiction than now might be given to the salaried shanbhogue. The village panchayet work also might be entrusted to the shanbhogue, as it was often represented that work was not being satisfactorily looked after now. In these ways he thought the present system could be improved at a cheap cost by combining offices. He therefore requested the Government to accept the representation.

In conclusion, he observed that the country was entering upon a new era when increased responsibilities were going to be entrusted to Indians, and at such a time it was advisable that every section of the population was enabled to realize its responsibilities. It would be dangerous to allow monopolistic tendencies to take deep root at such a time and this was the most important lesson which History taught. In this view the member appealed to Government to accept the representation unhesitatingly.

THE DEWAN said that the matter was under consideration and that no view could now be expressed.

At this stage the House adjourned for lunch and reassembled at 3-30 p.m.

No. 61.—Whole-time Wardens to girls' hostels.
Mrs. Kamalamma H. Dasappa, Women's Interest.

MRS. KAMALAMMA H. DASAPPA represented that whole-time Wardens to the girls' hostels in Bangalore and Mysore be appointed in order to ensure greater discipline and efficiency.

THE DEWAN observed that there might not be adequate work for whole-time Wardens.

MRS. KAMALAMMA H. DASAPPA added that the present practice of one of the teachers being appointed as *ex-officio* Warden was not found to be quite satisfactory.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION explained that so far as the Mysore Women's Hostel went, there was a Warden besides a Superintendent who was living in the premises of the hostel and that in place of the part-time Superintendent of the Bangalore Hostel, a full-time Matron had been appointed just the previous month as an experimental measure.

No. 54.—Revision of the scheme of girls' education in the middle and high school stages.

Mrs. D. Sakamma, Women's Interest.

MRS. D. SAKAMMA prayed that a committee of officials and non-officials be appointed to consider a revision of the scheme of instruction to girls in the middle and high school stages so as to make it fit in with the social economy of the people.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION explained that there was already a committee known as the Women's Education Advisory Committee which was dealing with the matter and that their views were being awaited.

THE DEWAN said that Mrs. Sakamma might be co-opted as a member of the committee.

No. 66.—Special provision for the expansion of girls' education.

Mrs. D. Sakamma, Women's Interest.

MRS. D. SAKAMMA represented that as the education of children of the masses, particularly of the girls, was not making sufficient progress, special provision be made for the expansion of girls' education in the State. She added that until Government did it, the progress of the State could not be rapid. For, the girls of to-day were the future mothers and they alone would be best suited to train their children who were going to be the backbone of the country.

While recognizing the need for the spread of girls' education, the DEWAN said that it was a matter of finance. It was a matter of grave concern for Government that the expansion of primary education had been held up for want of funds; and he assured the Assembly that as soon as the financial situation improved, the question would be taken up seriously.

MRS. SAKAMMA complained that Government were advancing the plea of financial stringency against every popular demand and suggested the saving of money under other heads of expenditure and diverting the funds for the expansion of girls' education, at least in one district as an experimental measure. She was particular that propaganda in favour of girls' education should be taken on hand immediately.

THE DEWAN said that if the member sent up a scheme of propaganda it would be considered.

No. 34.—Free supply of bamboos for putting up fences and wood for agricultural implements.

Messrs. Basavappa, Kumsi Sub-Taluk and V. V. Iyer, Shimoga Taluk.

MR. V. V. IYER prayed (*a*) that in view of the extensive wet cultivation in Shimoga District, the raiyats might be permitted to remove bamboos free from jungles for putting up fences to protect their crops; and (*b*) that they might also be granted permission to remove bamboos and wood for agricultural implements from the State Forests, under the Malnad Raiyats' Privileges Rules. He invited the attention of Government to the promise made on a previous occasion that the request would be granted, and complained that the same was not being given effect to by the local officers.

THE DEWAN replied that the Chief Conservator of Forests would see that the orders were given effect to.

RESOLUTIONS—(*Concluded*).

Resolution No. 3.

MOVERS.—MESSRS. M. C. LINGE GOWDA and S. C. MALLIAH (Mandya Taluk); K. V. VEERANNA (Chamarajanagar Taluk); C. MARI GOWDA (Krishnarajpet Taluk); K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA (Nagamangala Taluk); KULLE GOWDA, S. DEVAYYA and SIVANANJE GOWDA (Seringapatam Taluk); M. SUBBAIYA (Seringapatam Municipality); G. MALLANNA and R. DEVAYYA (Mysore Taluk); GURUKAR NANJAPPA (Gundlupet Taluk); B. CHANNAPPA (Yedatore Taluk); H. R. T. RAJAGOPALA MUDALIAR and HANUMANTHA SETTY (Hunsur Taluk); PUTTASWAMI GOWDA (Malvalli Taluk); H. C. DASAPPA and K. DHANAKOTI SETTY (Special Interests); T. MARIAPPA and IBRAHIM KHAN SAHIB (Minority Interests).

This Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that a mixed committee of officials and non-officials with a non-official majority be appointed to formulate a proper scheme of recruitment to ensure the adequate representation of all communities in all grades of service in the State.

MR. H. C. DASAPPA moved the resolution. He said that the members of the Assembly were repeatedly urging that the prevailing system of recruitment to the services should be revised so as to give more equitable representation to the backward classes, and that even though the Central Recruitment Board itself had submitted a revised scheme about 1½ years back, the Government had allowed it to lie over. In spite of the fact that there were some non-official members on that Board, he was sorry to have to criticise